

## REMARKS

Claims 9-11, 13-30, 35-52, 54-69, 117-123, 131-134 are pending in the present application, of which claims 117-121, 131-132 have been withdrawn from consideration. The Advisory Action dated February 7, 2006 indicated that the previously submitted After Final Amendment, dated January 20, 2006, was not entered.

In the Advisory Action, claims 24, 61, 64, 68, 69, 135, 136, 138, 139, 142, 143, 151, 152, 153, 158, 161, 162, 163, 166, 167, and 168 were indicated as lacking clear antecedent basis and the amendments were considered to introduce new substantive issues. The claims are presently amended to clearly provide the antecedent basis. The right to prosecute claims 135-168, such as in a continuing application, is hereby reserved.

Applicants appreciate the telephone interview with Examiner on March 9, 2006, in which it was agreed that there is antecedent basis for the term "fasteners" or "at least one fastener" in claims 64, 68, and 69, since independent claim 60 recites two webs wherein each web comprises a fastener. Thus a plurality of fasteners is defined in the base claim. Accordingly, the recitation of the plural term "fasteners" or "at least one fastener" in these dependent claims is not believed to require amendment.

On the basis of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that the pending claims of the present application are allowable over the prior art of record, and are in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and timely allowance of this application are respectfully requested.

The following remarks were made previously in the Amendment dated January 20, 2006, but are restated herein in relevant portion since the January 20 Amendment has not been entered of record.

### Interview Summary

Applicant acknowledges with appreciation the courtesy extended by the Examiner during the telephone call with the Applicant's attorney of record on December 12, 2005. In accordance with MPEP § 713.04, Applicant summarizes herewith the details of the telephone call with the Examiner.

During the telephone call, the independent claims were discussed with particular attention directed to claims 13 and 60. Applicant's attorney and the Examiner discussed the allowable

subject matter of claims 16 and 66, and the prior art relied upon in the Final Office Action. During the interview, it was determined that the subject matter of claim 16 in combination with independent claim 13 was allowable over the prior art, without the need to recite the features of intervening claims 14 and 15. Accordingly, the subject matter of claim 16 has been incorporated into independent claim 13, such that amended claim 13 now recites the allowable subject matter previously acknowledged by the Examiner. Further, claims 14 and 15 have been canceled.

Independent claims 13 and 60 have been amended to incorporate the allowable subject matter of claims 16 and 66, respectively; (ii) claims 17-21, 23-24, 61-65, 67-69, 133-134 have been amended to correct minor informalities respectively; and (iii) claims 9-11, 14-16, 25-30, 35-52, 54-59, 66, 117-123, and 131-132 have been canceled without prejudice. As no new matter is introduced and no new issues for consideration are raised, Applicant respectfully requests that these amendments be entered at this time.

#### Reasons for Allowance

As requested by the Examiner during the telephonic interview of December 12, 2005, Applicant provides the following Reasons for Allowance.

In the Final Office Action of September 20, 2005, the Examiner acknowledged claims 133 and 134 were in condition for allowance, and further objected to claims 16 and 66 for reciting allowable subject matter though being dependent on a rejected base claim. Applicant appreciates the Examiner's favorable review.

With regards to amended independent claims 13 and 133, the prior art does not disclose each feature as recited including, among other things, the use of a plurality of lasers as claimed. Moreover, dependent claims 17-24 are further allowable for reciting additional features not disclosed by the prior art relied upon by the Examiner.

With regards to amended independent claims 60 and 134, the prior art does not disclose or suggest each limitation as recited including, among other things, a plurality of webs, drums, and laser beams as claimed. Moreover, dependent claims 61-65, and 67-69 are further allowable for reciting additional features not disclosed by the prior art relied upon by the examiner.

**CONCLUSION**

On the basis of the foregoing Remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that the pending claims of the present application are allowable over the prior art of record. Claims 13, 17-24, 60-65, 67-69, and 133-134 are in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and timely allowance of this application are respectfully requested.

Applicant also submits that entry of this Amendment After Final and the accompanying Remarks would place the present application in better form for appeal, should the Examiner dispute the patentability of any of the pending claims.

Applicant authorizes the Commissioner to charge any fees (including fees for extra claims) and/or credit any overpayments associated with this paper to Winston & Strawn LLP Deposit Account No. 50-1814, Ref. No. 86012-29300-USPT

Further, if a fee is required for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 not provided for above or in the attached Petition, Applicant requests such extension and authorizes the charging of the extension fee to Winston & Strawn Deposit Account No. 50-1814, Ref. No. 86012-29300-USPT.

Respectfully submitted,

3/16/06  
Date

E. Bradley Gould 47,082 (Reg. No. 41,792)  
E. Bradley Gould (Reg. No. 41,792)

**WINSTON & STRAWN LLP**  
**CUSTOMER NO. 28763**

(202) 282-5771